1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Attorney General		
2	of the State of California PAUL C. AMENT Supervising Deputy Attorney General RICHARD D. MARINO, State Bar No. 90471 Deputy Attorney General ELAINE GYURKO Senior Legal Analyst California Department of Justice		
3			
4			
5			
6	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephones (212) 807 4044		
7	Telephone: (213) 897-4944 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395		
8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE RESPIRATORY CARE BOARD		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11	STATE OF CAL	H ORIVIN	
12	In the Matter of the Statement of Issues Against:	Case No. S-375	
13	JOHN PHILIP WIATRAK III 25835 Van Leuven Apt. #172	STATEMENT OF ISSUES	
14	Loma Linda, California 92354		
15	Respondent.		
16			
17	Complainant alleges:		
18	<u>PARTIES</u>		
19	1. Stephanie Nunez (Complainant) brings this Statement of Issues solely in		
20	her official capacity as the Executive Officer of the Respiratory Care Board of California, (Board)		
21	Department of Consumer Affairs.		
22	2. On or about June 30, 2006, the Board received an application for a		
23	Respiratory Care Practitioner License from John Philip Wiatrak III (Respondent). On or about		
24	June 27, 2006, respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements,		
25	answers, and representations in the application. The Board denied the application on October 23,		
26	2006.		
27	<u>JURISDICTION</u>		
28	3. This Statement of Issues is bro	ught before the Board under the authority of	

- 4. Section 3710 of the Code states: "The Respiratory Care Board of California, hereafter referred to as the board, shall enforce and administer this chapter [Chapter 8.3, the Respiratory Care Practice Act]."
- 5. Section 3718 of the Code states: "The board shall issue, deny, suspend, and revoke licenses to practice respiratory care as provided in this chapter."
 - 6. Section 3732, subdivision (b) of the Code states:

"The board may deny an application, or may order the issuance of a license with terms and conditions, for any of the causes specified in this chapter for suspension or revocation of a license, including, but not limited to, those causes specified in Sections 3750, 3750.5, 3752.5, 3752.6, 3755, 3757, 3760, and 3761."

7. Section 3750 of the Code states:

"The board may order the denial, suspension or revocation of, or the imposition of probationary conditions upon, a license issued under this chapter, for any of the following causes:

"

"(d) Conviction of a crime that substantially relates to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner. The record of conviction or a certified copy thereof shall be conclusive evidence of the conviction.

"…"

8. Section 3752 of the Code states:

"A plea or verdict of guilty or a conviction following a plea of nolo contendere made to a charge of any offense which substantially relates to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a respiratory care practitioner is deemed to be a conviction within the meaning of this article. The board shall order the license suspended or revoked, or may decline to issue a license, when the time for appeal has elapsed, or the judgment of conviction has been affirmed on appeal or when an

order granting probation is made suspending the imposition of sentence, irrespective of a subsequent order under Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code allowing the person to withdraw his or her plea of guilty and to enter a plea of not guilty, or setting aside the verdict of guilty, or dismissing the accusation, information, or indictment."

9. California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1399.370, states:

"For the purposes of denial, suspension, or revocation of a license, a crime or act shall be considered to be substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a respiratory care practitioner, if it evidences present or potential unfitness of a licensee to perform the functions authorized by his or her license or in a manner inconsistent with the public health, safety, or welfare. Such crimes or acts shall include but not be limited to those involving the following:

. . .

"(c) Conviction of a crime involving driving under the influence or reckless driving while under the influence. . . ."

COST RECOVERY

10. Section 3753.5, subdivision (a) of the Code states:

"In any order issued in resolution of a disciplinary proceeding before the board, the board or the administrative law judge may direct any practitioner or applicant found to have committed a violation or violations of law to pay to the board a sum not to exceed the costs of the investigation and prosecution of the case."

11. Section 3753.7 of the Code states:

"For purposes of the Respiratory Care Practice Act, costs of prosecution shall include attorney general or other prosecuting attorney fees, expert witness fees, and other administrative, filing, and service fees."

12. Section 3753.1, subdivision (a) of the Code states:

"An administrative disciplinary decision imposing terms of probation may include, among other things, a requirement that the licensee-probationer pay the

monetary costs associated with monitoring the probation."

CAUSE FOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION

(Conviction of a Crime)

13. Respondent's application is subject to denial under sections 3750, subdivision (d) and 3752 of the Business and Professions Code, and California Code of Regulations, Title 16, section 1399.370, subdivision (c), in conjunction with Business and Professions Code section 3732, subdivision (b), in that respondent was convicted of crimes substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a respiratory care practitioner. The circumstances are as follows:

August 4, 1998 Conviction

- A. On or about June 12, 1998, a Redlands police officer made an enforcement stop after he observed respondent driving his vehicle erratically. The officer noticed that Respondent's breath had an odor of alcohol, his eyes were bloodshot, his speech was slurred, and he stumbled as he walked. Respondent admitted he had been drinking. He failed to successfully complete the field sobriety tests. The results of his breath tests indicated his blood alcohol level was .19% and .21%.
- B. In San Bernardino County Superior Court, Complaint No. TRE30586, Respondent was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision(a), a misdemeanor (Count 1), and driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), a misdemeanor (Count 2).
- C. On or about August 4, 1998, respondent was convicted upon his plea of guilty to driving under the influence of alcohol (Count 1), and driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level (Count 2). He was placed on probation for three years on a number of terms and conditions, among others: pay a fine in the amount of \$1,224.00 and a fee in the amount of \$35.00, and complete a first offender alcohol program. His driving privilege was restricted for 3 months.

December 20, 1990 Conviction

- D. On or about November 2, 1990, in Riverside County Superior Court, Complaint No. 250593, Respondent was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor (Count 1), and driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision(b), a misdemeanor (Count 2), with prior convictions.
- E. On or about December 20, 1990, respondent was convicted upon his plea of guilty to driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level (Count 2), and admitted the prior convictions. He was placed on probation for four years on a number of terms and conditions, among others: serve 2 days in county jail, pay a fine in the amount of \$930.00 and a fee in the amount of \$20.00, and complete a second offender drinking driver program. His driving privilege was restricted for 12 months. Count 1 of the complaint was dismissed.

February 7, 1991 Conviction

- F. On or about January 2, 1991, in Riverside County Superior Court, Complaint No. 253655, Respondent was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor (Count 1); driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), a misdemeanor (Count 2), with a prior conviction; and driving with knowledge of a suspended driver's license, in violation of Vehicle Code section 14601.1, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor (Count 3).
- G. On or about February 7, 1991, Respondent was convicted upon his plea of guilty to driving under the influence of alcohol (Count 1). He was placed on probation for five years on a number of terms and conditions, among others: serve 120 days in county jail, and pay a fine in the amount of \$930.00 and a fee in the amount of \$20.00. His driving privilege was revoked for 3 years. Counts 2 and 3 of

the complaint were dismissed.

August 1, 1989 Conviction

- H. On or about June 18, 1989, Riverside police officers responded to a report of a traffic collision. Respondent admitted he was speeding and that he struck a vehicle which turned in front of him. The officers determined that Respondent was driving under the influence of alcohol, and he was arrested.
- I. On or about June 25, 1989, in Riverside County Superior Court, Complaint No. 224017, Respondent was charged with driving under the influence of alcohol, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor, (Count 1), and driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (b), a misdemeanor (Count 2).
- J. On or about August 1, 1989, respondent was convicted upon his plea of guilty to driving with .08% or higher blood alcohol level (Count 2). He was placed on probation for four years on a number of terms and conditions, among others: serve 2 days in county jail, pay a fine in the amount of \$815.00 and a fee in the amount of \$20.00, and complete a drinking driver program. His driving privilege was restricted for 12 months. Count 1 of the complaint was dismissed.

1	<u>PRAYER</u>	
2	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters	
3	herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Respiratory Care Board issue a decision	
4	1. Denying the application of John Philip Wiatrak III for a Respiratory	
5	Care Practitioner License;	
6	2. Directing John Philip Wiatrak III to pay the Respiratory Care Board	
7	the costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, and if placed on probation, the	
8	costs of probation monitoring; and	
9	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and	
10	proper.	
11	DATED: March 7, 2007	
12		
13	Original signed by Liane Zimmerman for:	
14	STEPHANIE NUNEZ Executive Officer Respiratory Care Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs State of California Complainant	
15		
16		
17	1	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		